

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-30 were rejected. With this Amendment, no claims were amended, added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-30 remain at issue.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1, 8-10, 12, 14-15, 17, 24-26, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Aucsmith, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,144). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Aucsmith, et al. discloses decryption using the public key of the issuer. (See col. 12, lines 28-29.) Aucsmith, et al. does not disclose or suggest that the public key used to encrypt or decrypt the template stored in the person identification certificate is a different public key depending upon the entity which executes authentication of a person, as required by claim 1. Thus claim 1, and claims 8-10, 12 and 14-15 that depend from claim 1, are allowable over Aucsmith, et al. For reasons similar to those discussed regarding claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17, 24-26, 28 and 30 are also allowable over Aucsmith, et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 2-7, 11, 13, 16, 18-23, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aucsmith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,144). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Aucsmith, et al. does not disclose or suggest that the public key used to encrypt or decrypt the template stored in the person identification certificate is a different


public key depending upon the entity which executes authentication of a person, as required by claim 1. Thus it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aucsmith, et al. to derive claims 2-7, 11, 13 and 16, that depend from claim 1. For similar reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aucsmith, et al. to derive claims 18-23, 27 and 29 that depend from claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 21, 2006

By:   
Marina N. Saito  
Registration No. 42,121  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000